DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 165 HE 035 177

TITLE	Establishing Performance Indicators To Assess Progress toward Meeting the Goals of "The Illinois Commitment": Preliminary Recommendations. An Interim Report of the Performance Indicator Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State Board of Higher Education, Springfield.
PUB DATE	2002-08-20
NOTE	59p.; For the Final Recommendations, see HE 035 590.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Indicators; Educational Objectives; *Higher Education; *Measurement Techniques; Performance Factors
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois

ABSTRACT

Developing a system of performance indicators is a critical facet in further implementation of the Illinois Commitment, the state's higher education plan. The performance indicators are intended to measure how well the system of higher education is meeting the six major goals of the plan. This interim report presents information on the work of the Performance Indicator Advisory Committee to date, the preliminary recommendations of the Committee with regard to a set of 38 potential statewide and common institutional indicators, and a proposed plan and timeline for gathering public input on these recommendations for the coming months. Also addressed are the Committee's recommendations related to a number of implementation issues related to the technical and logistical aspects of establishing performance indicators. The 17 statewide and 21 common institutional indicators included in this preliminary report are intended to represent potential indicators for consideration and discussion by the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the Illinois higher education community. Mission-specific indicators will be developed by each institution. The rest of the indicator establishment process is outlined, and the discussion process reviewed. An appendix lists the indicators. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 468 165

ESTABLISHING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS TO ASSESS PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING THE GOALS OF *THE ILLINOIS COMMITMENT:*

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

An Interim Report of the Performance Indicator Advisory Committee to the Illinois Board of Higher Education

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Lorton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presented
August 20, 2002

HE035170

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Page

Members of the Illinois Board of Higher Education
Performance Indicator Advisory Committee ii

Background and Overview 1

Performance Indicator Policy Framework 2

Performance Indicator Advisory Committee 2

Preliminary Recommendations on Potential Statewide and
Common Institutional Performance Indicators 3

- Preface 3
- The Importance of Context in Reporting Indicators 5
- Goal 1 Recommendations 6
- Goal 2 Recommendations 7
- Goal 3 Recommendations 8
- Goal 4 Recommendations 9
- Goal 5 Recommendations 10
- Goal 6 Recommendations 11

Recommendations on Implementation Issues 13

- Implementation Issues 13
- Recommended Timeline for Implementation 15

Conclusion 16

Appendix A: Recommended Statewide and Common Institutional
Performance Indicators 17

Appendix B: Suggested Operational Parameters 31

Members of the Illinois Board of Higher Education
Performance Indicator Advisory Committee

Dan Layzell (Chair)
Deputy Director for Planning and Technology
Illinois Board of Higher Education

Ken Andersen
Chair, IBHE Faculty Advisory Committee
Professor Emeritus, Speech Communication
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Trudy Bers
Senior Director, Research Curriculum &
Planning & Exec. Asst. to the President
Oakton Community College

Steve Bragg
Vice President for Finance and Planning
Illinois State University

Katie Cox
Student Member, IBHE
University of Illinois at Springfield

Jim Elsass
Associate Vice President for Budget
Northwestern University

Bernard M. Ferreri
Assoc. Vice Chancellor for Arts and Sciences
City Colleges of Chicago

Sally Ferguson
Director of Institutional Research
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville

Chet Gardner
Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Illinois

Laura P. Hartman
Associate Vice President and Professor of
Business Ethics
DePaul University

Ed Hines
Professor, Education Administration and
Foundations
Illinois State University

Virginia McMillan
Executive Vice President
Illinois Community College Board

Richard Vertrees
Vice President, Finance & Administration
Lincoln Land Community College

Special recognition also goes to Dr. Charles Evans, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Illinois, Dr. Scott Parke, Senior Director for Policy Studies at the Illinois Community College Board, and David Tretter, Vice President of the Federation of Illinois Independent Colleges and Universities for their assistance in this effort.

Background and Overview

Developing a system of performance indicators is a critical facet in further implementation of *The Illinois Commitment*. In December 2001, the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) approved a proposed methodology and process regarding the development and implementation of a set of performance indicators to help assess how well Illinois' system of higher education is meeting the six major goals of this plan. The methodology and process are based on several guiding principles, including the following:

- The indicators will be directly linked to the goals of *The Illinois Commitment*.[1]
- There will be three levels of indicators: **statewide indicators** related to Illinois' overall system of higher education; **"common" indicators** for all institutions; and **mission-specific indicators** related to each institution's unique role and mission within the state's system of higher education.
- The indicators will be developed using existing/established data sources, measures, and reporting activities to the extent possible. Further, all efforts will be made to streamline related measures and reporting activities.
- The total number of indicators will be minimized to the extent possible.
- The statewide and "common" institutional indicators will be developed through a highly consultative process, involving the IBHE and members of the Illinois higher education community.
- Each institution will have responsibility for developing and proposing its own goals for each "common" and mission-specific institutional indicator.
- The performance indicators selected will remain in place for several years to allow institutions to identify, implement, and evaluate outcomes and improvement strategies.
- The performance indicators selected will continue to be refined in coming years.

A Performance Indicator Advisory Committee comprised of representatives from Illinois public universities, community colleges, and private institutions was established to provide guidance to IBHE staff on the development of recommendations regarding the statewide and common institutional indicators. Institutions have also been requested to identify a limited number of mission-specific performance indicators as part of their results report submission this year.

At the outset, it should be emphasized that the purpose for establishing these indicators and the related goal-setting process at the state and institutional purpose is to provide a more objective assessment of how well the Illinois system of higher education is doing in meeting the overall goals of *The Illinois Commitment*. In short, these indicators are a further evolution of related accountability reporting that began with the annual results reports in 1999.

---

[1] Can be found at http://www.ibhe.state.il.us/Board/Agendas/1999/February/1999-02-07.pdf.

This interim report presents information on the work of the Committee to date, the preliminary recommendations of the Committee with regard to a set of 38 potential statewide and common institutional indicators, and a proposed plan and timeline for gathering public input on these recommendations in the coming months. Also addressed in this report are the Committee's recommendations related to a number of implementation issues related to the technical and logistical aspects of establishing performance indicators.

Performance Indicator Policy Framework

The six *Illinois Commitment* goals serve as the basic policy framework for the development of all three sets of performance indicators. Figure 1 illustrates the indicator framework.

FIGURE 1
POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RELATED TO *THE ILLINOIS COMMITMENT*

As described earlier, the **statewide indicators** will pertain to the performance of Illinois' system of higher education as a whole, the **common institutional indicators** will be a common set of measures reported by all institutions, and the **mission-specific indicators** will be related to each institution's unique role and mission within the state. All three types of indicators will have a direct linkage to the goals of *The Illinois Commitment*. Both the common and mission-specific institutional indicators will be included in each institution's annual results report, and then will be integrated into the statewide results report presented by IBHE staff each December, along with the statewide indicators.

The Performance Indicators Advisory Committee

The charge to the Performance Indicators Advisory Committee is to provide guidance on the development and implementation of recommendations with regard to the "common" and statewide indicators for consideration by the IBHE. The Committee includes 12 representatives from Illinois public universities, community colleges, and private institutions, and is chaired by the IBHE Deputy Director for Planning and Technology.

The Committee has met six times since its inception in January 2002.[2] During that time, the Committee:

[2]Committee agenda materials are at http://www.ibhe.state.il.us/PerformanceIndicators/default.htm.

- Reviewed and affirmed the proposed guiding principles for developing and implementing performance indicators;

- Reviewed and affirmed the proposed indicator framework; and,

- Developed preliminary recommendations on potential statewide and common institutional indicators.

The Committee will continue to be involved in refining the recommended statewide and common institutional performance indicators in the coming months leading up to the final report and recommendations to be submitted to the IBHE for action in December 2002.

Preliminary Recommendations on Potential Statewide and Common Institutional Performance Indicators

Preface

This section of the report presents the preliminary recommendations of the Committee to the IBHE on 38 potential statewide and common institutional indicators. Recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators are presented for each of the six goals of *The Illinois Commitment*, including the Committee's rationale in selecting the indicators and related comments.

IBHE staff will have the responsibility for reporting on the statewide indicators. The recommended common institutional indicators will apply to all Illinois institutions of higher education (public and private) unless otherwise noted. A more detailed description of the recommended indicators, including the rationale for including each indicator, the basis for measurement, the basis for assessing performance, whether the related data are collected regularly, and likely data sources is included in Appendix A. A draft set of operational parameters for many of the potential indicators developed by the Committee is included in Appendix B.

As indicated in Appendix A, data are already collected for many of the indicators through existing sources. However, there are some areas, particularly with regard to Goals 2, 3, and 5, where current data systems either do not exist or are inadequate for the recommended indicators. The Committee recognizes that enhanced or new data collection efforts will take time to implement but will ultimately result in more useful information for accountability reporting.

Potential Indicators. The 17 statewide and 21 common institutional indicators included in this preliminary report are intended to represent a set of appropriate potential indicators for consideration and discussion by the IBHE and Illinois higher education community in the coming months. In turn, the Committee will use the input received to develop a much smaller, final set of recommended statewide and common institutional indicators that will be submitted to the IBHE in December 2002.

In developing the recommendations to the IBHE on this potential list of indicators, the Committee attempted to balance comprehensiveness in coverage with the guiding principle of minimizing the total number of indicators adopted. This was not an easy task given the

complexity of Illinois' system of higher education and the multi-dimensionality of the goals of *The Illinois Commitment.*

However, the Committee also recognized that the performance indicators ultimately adopted will be an important component to the many and varied accountability mechanisms in place at the state level for Illinois colleges and universities. In short, these 38 indicators represent the consensus of the Committee on the most appropriate "menu of options" for statewide and common institutional indicators, which will then be refined to a much more manageable number based on input from the IBHE and Illinois higher education community.

Importance of Mission Specific Indicators. The mission specific indicators being developed by each institution will be extremely important in illustrating each institution's unique contribution to the system in concert with the broader "common institutional indicators." As such, the Committee's approach in developing recommendations for the potential common institutional indicators was to identify indicators that are universal across Illinois colleges and universities relying on the mission-specific indicators to highlight the distinctive and unique contributions of each institution and sector. At the same time, however, the common institutional indicators will also allow for institutional differences through the goal-setting process.

Use of Dichotomous Indicators. In the case of Goals 1, 2, 4, and 5, the common institutional indicators include dichotomous (i.e., yes/no) "checklists" of institutional strategies or activities related to the stated goal. The purpose for this is twofold: first, while not a quantitative measure *per se*, such lists provide an indication of institutional commitment regarding attainment of each of the four goals; second, particularly for these four goals, such strategies or activities should be in place at the institutional level for the desired outcome to be achieved.

Ongoing Refinement of Performance Indicators. The implementation of the performance indicators ultimately selected likely will result in unforeseen challenges (technical and otherwise), particularly in the early years of reporting. As such, it should be understood and accepted at the outset that this effort will require ongoing refinement as the IBHE and Illinois higher education community develop a base of experience with performance indicator reporting.

Comment on the Goal-Setting Process. As noted at the beginning of this report, the purpose for establishing the indicators is to provide a more empirical assessment of how well Illinois' system of higher education is doing in meeting the overall goals of *The Illinois Commitment*, and to be a part of the broader accountability mechanisms in place for Illinois higher education. A guiding principle of this effort from the start has been that each institution will have the responsibility for developing and proposing goals for the common and mission specific indicators given that the goals for these indicators should in part reflect the unique characteristics and mission of each institution, within the broader context of *The Illinois Commitment.*

The Committee believes that the goals set by each institution for common institutional and mission-specific indicators should be rigorous, but also achievable. There should also be a formal "feedback loop" at the state and institutional levels by which the results are used to identify areas of performance in need of improvement and to establish improvement plans. However, given that implementation of the indicators will require periodic adjustments, the Committee believes that the goal-setting and improvement processes should have room for refinement in the early years as well.

The Committee has also considered the multi-dimensionality and comprehensiveness of the goals of *The Illinois Commitment*. Indeed, one of the challenges in keeping the number of performance indicators to a minimum is that the broad scope of the goals defies simple measurement. The Committee also believes that a "feedback loop" at the state and institutional levels also can serve the useful purpose of refining the goals of *The Illinois Commitment*.

The Importance of Context in Reporting Performance Indicators

Colleges and universities, like other organizations, are affected in many ways by the demographic, educational, economic, and political environments in which they operate. As such, it is important to recognize that measures of institutional performance will reflect the impact of these environmental dimensions as well. Further, these dimensions can have differential impacts at the state and local levels. For example, aggregate employment needs by occupation at the state level can vary in magnitude at the local labor market level due to natural differences in regional economic emphases across the state. Figure 2 below presents examples of relevant factors within each of these environmental dimensions.

FIGURE 2
EXAMPLES OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS IMPACTING HIGHER EDUCATION

Environmental Dimension	Examples of Relevant Factors
Demographic Context	➢ Trends in state population, overall and by race/ethnicity ➢ Socio-economic profile of residents ➢ Trends in the number of Illinois high school graduates
Educational Context	➢ Levels of educational attainment and skill levels of Illinois residents ➢ Educational preparedness of Illinois high school graduates for college-level work.
Economic Context	➢ Trends in employment and unemployment ➢ Employment needs by occupation and industry
Political Context	➢ Financial support provided to Illinois higher education by local, state, and federal governments ➢ The overall policy environment for higher education in Illinois

The Committee recommends that the IBHE staff provide meaningful, but focused state-level context in the reporting mechanisms (e.g., results reports) for the indicators ultimately selected. It is expected that each institution will also include the relevant context in its reporting on common institutional and mission-specific indicators.

Goal 1: Higher Education Will Help Illinois Business and Industry Sustain Strong Economic Growth

Preliminary Recommendations

The Committee's preliminary recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators related to Goal 1 are shown in Figure 3 below.

FIGURE 3
RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS RELATED TO GOAL 1

Statewide Indicators	Common Institutional Indicators
➢ Satisfaction of Illinois business and industry with Illinois higher education ➢ Annual sponsored research expenditures ➢ Annual technology transfer activities (e.g., patents, licenses) ➢ Annual number of graduates by level and broad field of study	➢ Percent of baccalaureate recipients either employed or enrolled in further education within one year of graduation ➢ Number of continuing education, training, and service programs offered by institutions for non-student business and industry audiences ➢ Collaborative Activities with Business and Industry (Yes/No): ▪ Has formalized training programs ▪ Offers continuing professional education programs ▪ Offers cooperative work-study programs ▪ Has external advisory councils for degree programs ▪ Has research partnerships with business and industry ▪ Has economic development partnerships with local and/or state governments

Committee Rationale and Comments

The recommended indicators related to Goal 1 cover the major connections between higher education and the state's economy, including providing individuals with the education and training to meet Illinois' workforce needs, providing training and professional development opportunities for Illinois employers and employees, research and development activities (basic and applied), and technology transfer activities. All of these efforts contribute to the goal of helping Illinois business and industry sustain strong economic growth.

It should also be recognized that the teaching, research, and service contributions of Illinois colleges and universities also have many impacts as well, economic and otherwise, beyond the borders of the state, given the increasingly global nature of the economy.

Goal 2: Higher Education Will Join Elementary and Secondary Education to Improve Teaching and Learning at All Levels

Preliminary Recommendations

The Committee's preliminary recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators related to Goal 2 are shown in Figure 4 below.

FIGURE 4
RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS RELATED TO GOAL 2

Statewide Indicators	Common Institutional Indicators
➢ Annual number of students completing requirements for initial teacher certification by certificate area	➢ Annual number of students completing requirements for initial teacher certification by certificate area[#]
➢ Annual number of students completing requirements for initial teacher certification by race/ethnicity	➢ Passage rate of students completing requirements for initial teacher certification in state competency tests by subject area[#]
➢ Passage rate of students completing requirements for initial teacher certification in state competency tests by subject-matter area	➢ Number of teachers and administrators served by the institution as a State Board of Education registered provider through professional development activities
	➢ Strategies to Foster P-16 Partnerships (Yes/No): ▪ Has formalized partnerships with P-12 schools and school districts ▪ Provides teacher endorsement content training for P-12 teachers ▪ Collaborates with P-12 schools and school districts on recruitment and retention of new teachers. ▪ Collaborates with P-12 schools and school districts on professional development for teachers and administrators

[#] Only applies to institutions with teacher education programs.

Committee Rationale and Comments

The recommended indicators related to Goal 2 focus on current and emerging linkages between higher education and P-12 education in Illinois. These indicators focus on the quality of

teacher preparation programs, graduates, and services provided by institutions to practicing educators (teachers and administrators) across Illinois. All of these are necessary factors in improving teaching and learning at the elementary and secondary levels.

The Committee also recognizes the importance of the many statewide initiatives currently underway to improve the quality and supply of teachers in meeting Goal 2. These initiatives include the recently adopted legislation requiring students to pass the state teacher basic skills competency test before admission to a baccalaureate teacher education program in Illinois, and the requirement that all teacher education programs in Illinois ultimately incorporate and be evaluated against National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards to assure program quality.

Goal 3: No Illinois Citizen Will Be Denied an Opportunity For a College Education Because of Financial Need

Preliminary Recommendations

The Committee's preliminary recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators related to Goal 3 are shown in Figure 5 below.

FIGURE 5
RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS RELATED TO GOAL 3

Statewide Indicators	Common Institutional Indicators
➢ Average undergraduate tuition and fees vs. Illinois per capita disposable income (by sector) ➢ Distribution of financial aid received by undergraduates by type and source of aid (by sector) ➢ Proportion of enrolled undergraduate students who receive financial aid by type of aid and overall (by sector) ➢ Average Monetary Award Program (MAP) award as a percent of weighted average undergraduate tuition and fees (by sector) ➢ Net price of attendance for undergraduates who receive aid by income quintile, after MAP, Pell, and institutional grant aid are subtracted (by sector)[#]	➢ Distribution of financial aid received by undergraduates by type and source of aid ➢ Proportion of enrolled undergraduate students who receive financial aid, by type of aid and overall ➢ Net price of attendance for undergraduates who apply for aid by income quintile, after MAP, Pell, and institutional grant aid are subtracted[#]

[#]The "net price" reflects the total cost of attendance for a student at an institution as determined by the institution for use in making financial aid awards to undergraduates, including tuition and fees, housing (e.g., room and board), transportation, books, and supplies.

Committee Rationale and Comments

This goal is perhaps the most difficult to measure of all six goals. However, it is possible to make an assessment on whether related trends (i.e., costs of attendance and financial aid) run counter to the goal of reducing financial impediments to a college education, which is the rationale behind the selection of these potential indicators. Also included in the set of potential indicators is an assessment of the remaining need at various student and family income levels after federal, state, and institutional grant aid is subtracted. This is a measure of affordability for students of various economic backgrounds.

The Committee recognizes that these potential measures represent just a beginning in developing reliable and meaningful indicators regarding college affordability. In addition, the IBHE will be leading a discussion on affordability-related policy issues during the next several months that will likely result in recommendations on strategies and actions related to this goal.

Goal 4: Illinois Will Increase the Number and Diversity of Citizens Completing Training and Education Programs

Preliminary Recommendations

The Committee's preliminary recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators related to Goal 4 are shown in Figure 6 below.

FIGURE 6
RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS RELATED TO GOAL 4

Statewide Indicators	Common Institutional Indicators
➢ Completions by race/ethnicity, disability status, and gender (by level and sector)#	➢ Completions by race/ethnicity, disability status, and gender (by level)# ➢ Institutional Strategies to Increase the Number and Diversity of Students Completing Academic Programs (Yes/No): ▪ Has academic support services (e.g., tutoring, supplemental instruction) ▪ Has student support services (e.g., counseling, career services) ▪ Has institutional diversity policy ▪ Has institutional diversity office/coordinator ▪ Has institutional diversity committee ▪ Has institutional office for international students/coordinator ▪ Has institutional office for students with disabilities/coordinator

#Includes both the number and relative proportion of completions by race/ethnicity, disability status, and gender.

Committee Rationale and Comments

The recommended indicators for Goal 4 relate not only to the stated goal of increasing the number and diversity of individuals completing postsecondary education programs in Illinois, but also the equally important strategies that are in place to facilitate that goal at the institutional level. A related and important source of information on attainment of this goal is the annual Underrepresented Groups Report.

Goal 5: Illinois Colleges and Universities Will Hold Students to Even Higher Expectations for Learning and Will be Accountable for the Quality of Academic Programs and the Assessment of Learning

Preliminary Recommendations

The Committee's preliminary recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators related to Goal 5 are shown in Figure 7 below.

FIGURE 7
RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS RELATED TO GOAL 5

Statewide Indicators	Common Institutional Indicators
➢ State-level quality assurance processes in place: ▪ State approval required to offer specific academic programs ▪ State requirement that institutions assess student learning at the program level ▪ State requirement to review programs for improvement on a regular basis	➢ Extent to which institutional quality and effectiveness are recognized by graduates ➢ Pass rates on professional/occupational licensure exams relative to state and/or national averages ➢ Proportion of all degree programs with a systematic assessment of student learning outcomes ➢ Proportion of all degree programs meeting standards for program accreditation for which program accreditation is available ➢ Institutional Commitment to Academic Quality and Assessment (Yes/No): ▪ Has an institution-wide policy of using assessment results to improve program quality. ▪ Has formalized end of program assessment for all academic programs

Committee Rationale and Comments

The recommended indicators for Goal 5 focus primarily on the strategies used by colleges and universities to enhance learning outcomes and program quality. The focus of this goal is for all Illinois institutions to have in place a systematic assessment process to determine

what students know and are able to do as a result of completing a program of study. In turn, these assessment results must be used to improve the quality of teaching and student learning.

In recent years, regional accrediting bodies for colleges and universities such as the North Central Association (the accrediting body for colleges and universities in Illinois) have turned to formalizing the assessment of student learning outcomes and have identified the assessment process as a necessary element of quality. The North Central Association (NCA) requires that every accredited institution implement a comprehensive process to assess student academic achievement. Further, the NCA differentiates between direct (e.g., performance on standardized tests and professional licensure/certification exams) and indirect (e.g., surveys of student, alumni, and employer satisfaction) measures of student achievement.

The common institutional indicators provide a view of the types of assessment activities in place at each institution, as well as some very limited measures of student achievement. The statewide indicator is simply a synthesis of what quality assurance mechanisms are in place at the state-level. Given the breadth and diversity of academic programs across the state, it is appropriate that the major focus be at the institutional level.

The Committee also recognizes that the IBHE's current efforts related to the development and implementation of assessment plans for general education and academic programs, in collaboration with public colleges and universities across the state, are a central component in achieving this goal. As such, the performance indicators related to Goal 5 will need to be consistent with these efforts, as well as the broader requirements of the North Central Association.

Goal 6: Illinois Colleges and Universities Will Continually Improve Productivity, Cost-Effectiveness, and Accountability

Preliminary Recommendations

The Committee's preliminary recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators related to Goal 6 are shown in Figure 8 below.

FIGURE 8
RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS RELATED TO GOAL 6

Statewide Indicators	Common Institutional Indicators
➢ Cost of instruction per credit hour by student level: sector averages#	➢ Undergraduate time to degree (Bachelor's and Associate separately).
➢ Percent of first-time, full-time freshmen who complete their degree within 150% of normal time, or are still enrolled or transferred: range by sector.	➢ Cost of instruction per credit hour by student level and as a percent of weighted sector average by level#
➢ Administrative and support cost per credit hour (all levels): sector averages#	➢ Administrative and support cost per credit hour (all levels) and as a percent of sector average#
	➢ Percent of first-time, full-time freshmen who complete their degree within 150% of normal time, or are still enrolled or transferred.

#Applies only to public universities and community colleges.

Committee Rationale and Comments

At a broad level, achievement of Goal 6 is a natural result of achievement of the previous five goals. If Illinois' colleges and universities are addressing Goals 1 through 5, a natural result should be improved productivity, cost-effectiveness, and accountability. However, the Committee also recognizes that the implied focus of this goal is fiscal and programmatic accountability. Thus, the recommended indicators for Goal 6 address the stated goals of productivity and cost-effectiveness from both an instructional and administrative perspective. On the instructional side, the recommended indicators include both cost and outcome measures. On the administrative side, the data will provide a perspective on institutional resources devoted to administrative operations at public colleges and universities.

Recommendations on Implementation-Related Issues

Implementation Issues

Equally important to the preliminary recommendations on performance indicators are the steps necessary to bring them to fruition. The following are suggested steps by the Committee regarding some key implementation issues.

Gathering Public Input on Recommended Potential Indicators. As noted at the beginning, the 38 recommended indicators included in this report represent the Committee's consensus on the most appropriate menu of options for potential statewide and common institutional indicators, that will need to be refined to a much more manageable number based on input from the IBHE and Illinois higher education community. The Committee recommends the following strategies for gathering this input in a comprehensive and systematic manner:

- Meetings with all IBHE advisory committees.
- Meetings with appropriate constituency groups such as the Chief Academic Officers of Illinois public colleges and universities and the Illinois Association for Institutional Research (IAIR).
- Gathering written comments (via e-mail and hard copy) from members of the Illinois higher education community and other interested individuals.
- Establishing an ongoing "web forum" for individuals to provide feedback on the potential indicators and related issues via the IBHE website.

Together, these activities will enable interested individuals and groups from throughout the state to provide the input necessary for crafting a more refined, final list of indicators. The Committee also recommends a set of standard questions for participants across the various information-gathering strategies in order to provide focus and consistency in feedback, including the following:

- In your opinion, which of the indicators are most appropriate?
- In your opinion, which of the indicators are least appropriate?
- Are there indicators that are appropriate but missing from the list?
- What caveats and suggestions can you provide regarding operational definitions and implementation strategies for any or all of the indicators?
- What advice can you provide about goal-setting strategies at the institutional level?

The process for gathering this input will begin immediately and conclude in early November 2002. At that point, the Committee will reconvene and develop the final recommendations to be submitted to the IBHE for action in December 2002.

Resolution of Technical Issues (Operational Definitions and Data Sources) and Timing and Phase-In of Performance Indicators. Once the indicators have been finalized,

operational definitions and data sources will need to be determined, particularly for those indicators where no current data exist. The Committee has already developed a draft list of operational definitions for many of the indicators (see Appendix B) that can serve as a basis for further discussion and refinement. Further, while the indicators for which data are already available can be implemented immediately, those for which data are not available will take time to bring on-line, although all should be able to be reported by 2005. Finally, determination will need to be made on the format in which indicators will be presented. Committee members will take the lead on these activities with input from other colleagues throughout the state, including IAIR.

Institutional Goal-Setting for Common Institutional Indicators. Institutions should begin the goal-setting process once the indicators have been finalized, with the full involvement of all campus governance groups. The Committee believes that the goals set by each institution should be rigorous, but also achievable. There should also be formalized "feedback loops" at the state and institutional levels by which the results are used to identify areas of performance in need of improvement and to establish improvement plans. However, given that implementation of the indicators will require periodic adjustments, the goal-setting and improvement processes should have room for refinement in the early years as well.

The Relationship Between Performance Indicator Reporting and Annual Results Reports. The purpose of the annual results report submissions is to document how institutions are addressing and meeting each of the six goals of *The Illinois Commitment*. Thus, a natural evolution is for institutions to use their results report submissions as the medium for reporting the common institutional indicators and mission specific indicators on an annual basis. *When reporting of performance indicators is included in the annual results reports, other reporting requirements will be reduced so as to not expand the burden of reporting and to keep the results reports focused and useful.*

The state level indicators will then be compiled and reported by IBHE staff in developing the statewide results report, along with a synthesis of the common institutional and mission-specific indicator results. Given that it will not be possible to include all institutional responses on the common institutional and mission-specific indicators in the statewide results report, the Committee also recommends that each institution's report (including context, goals, and indicator results) be posted separately to the IBHE's web site.

Ongoing Refinement of Performance Indicators. The implementation of the performance indicators ultimately selected likely will result in unforeseen challenges (technical and otherwise), particularly in the early years of reporting. As such, it should be understood and accepted at the outset that this effort will require ongoing refinement as the IBHE and Illinois higher education community develop a base of experience with performance indicator reporting.

The Continued Role of the Advisory Committee in Implementation Activities. The Committee should remain an active participant in the implementation phase of this effort given the importance of maintaining continuity.

Recommended Timeline for Implementation

The Committee recommends the following timeline in finalizing these indicators and moving forward with implementation:

- **Fall 2002**: Public input gathered on recommendations.
- **December 2002**: Final recommendations on statewide and common institutional indicators presented to IBHE.
- **Spring – Summer 2003**: Technical and operational issues identified and resolved, including a schedule for bringing all indicators "on line."
- **August 2003**: *First Reporting Cycle.* Institutional reporting of common and mission-specific indicators for which the required data or information are available in annual results report submissions.
- **December 2003**: First report on existing indicators as part of Statewide Results Report.
- **2004**: *Second Reporting Cycle.* Ongoing refinement and implementation of remaining indicators.
- **2005**: *Third Reporting Cycle.* Further refinement; remaining indicators brought "on line".

There will likely need to be adjustments made to this timeline, particularly after the discussions on technical and operational issues and the first reporting cycle are completed.

Conclusion

The recommendations on potential indicators and implementation issues included in this preliminary report provide a solid basis for discussion with the IBHE and colleagues around the state regarding the establishment of performance indicators to assess progress toward meeting the goals of *The Illinois Commitment*. Likewise, implementation of these indicators will provide an opportunity for further discussion on the overall goals of *The Illinois Commitment*. Indeed, the very process in developing these preliminary recommendations over the past several months has caused serious (but healthy) reflection among Committee members on what the six goals really "mean," what they are intended to achieve, and where further refinements are needed. For example, it became clear along the way that there is currently no stated goal that "Illinois' system of higher education will help to improve the quality of life for Illinois citizens." As such, the Committee strongly encourages the IBHE to revisit the goals of *The Illinois Commitment* in the future.

Clearly, many issues will be brought to light as the IBHE and others have a chance to provide input and suggestions on these recommendations, and in the ultimate implementation of the indicators. Further, it is likely that periodic refinements will be required as technical, logistical, and other issues arise during implementation. In the end, however, the Committee is confident that the indicators ultimately selected will demonstrate accountability to Illinoisans regarding the successes and opportunities for further improvement of their system of higher education in meeting the goals set forth in *The Illinois Commitment*.

APPENDIX A

POTENTIAL STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:

Rationale, Bases for Measurement, Bases for Assessing Performance And Likely Data Sources

POTENTIAL STATEWIDE AND COMMON INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Goal 1: Economic Growth (Statewide)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
1S1: Satisfaction of Illinois business and industry with Illinois higher education	A measure of feedback from business and industry within the state on how well Illinois' system of higher education as a whole is meeting the state's needs in the areas of workforce demand, training, and technology transfer.	Both continuous/numeric and dichotomous (e.g., yes/no)	Internal benchmarking	*No - Periodic surveys at the state level.*
1S2: Annual sponsored research expenditures	A measure of the extent of externally funded research activities within Illinois' system of higher education.	Continuous/numeric	Both internal benchmarking and external comparisons.	Yes - National Science Foundation annual surveys.
1S3: Annual technology transfer activities (e.g., patents, licenses)	Indicates the extent of the linkage between research and other scholarly activities within Illinois' system of higher education and the marketplace, particularly as this linkage helps contribute to the growth and productivity of business and industry.	Continuous/numeric	Both internal benchmarking and external comparisons	Yes - Association of University Technology Managers Annual Survey
1S4: Annual number of graduates by level and broad field of study	A measure of the potential supply of college-educated individuals for the state's workforce.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - IPEDS

Goal 1: Economic Growth (Common Institutional Indicators)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
1C1: Percent of degree/certificate recipients either employed or enrolled in further education within one year of graduation	A measure of the relative success of the institution in preparing students to enter the workforce or pursue further specialized education and training.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Periodic surveys by institutions
1C2: Numbers of continuing education, training, and service programs offered by institutions for business and industry audiences.[3]	Indicates the extent to which the Illinois system of higher education is meeting the continuing education, training, and service needs of the state.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Institutions
1C3: Collaborative Activities with Business and Industry ▪ Has formalized training programs ▪ Offers continuing professional education ▪ Offers cooperative work-study programs ▪ Has external advisory councils for degree programs ▪ Has research partnerships with business and industry ▪ Has economic development partnerships with local and/or state governments	Reflects the institution's linkage with state and local business, industry, and workforce needs.	Dichotomous	Internal benchmarking	*No - Institutions*

[3] The criteria for inclusion as a "program" within this indicator includes the following: (1) the primary audience for the program must be private sector organizations, although it can also include programs directed to public sector organizations if the purpose is related to economic development; (2) there must be active involvement in program development by an institutional representative on behalf of the institution, beyond simple room or facility assignment; and (3) program participants must register or enroll. Within these criteria, the programs can include all credit and non-credit activities offered on- or off-campus, including customized training programs developed for business and industry clientele by the institution.

Goal 2: Partnerships with P-12 Education (Statewide)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
2S1: Annual number of students completing requirements for initial certification by certificate area[4]	A measure of the potential supply of new teachers in Illinois.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Institutions/ISBE
2S2: Annual number of students completing requirements for initial certification by race/ethnicity[4]	Reflects the degree of diversity within the supply of new teachers in Illinois.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Institutions/ISBE
2S3: Passage rate of students completing requirements for initial teacher certification in state competency tests by subject-matter area	A minimum measure of new teacher competency. Also an indicator of teacher education program quality.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - ISBE

[4] Includes completers of initial certificate programs.

Goal 2: Partnerships with P-12 Education (Common Institutional Indicators)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
2C1: Annual number of students completing requirements for initial certification by certificate area[5]	A measure of the potential supply of new teachers produced by the institution.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Institutions/ISBE
2C2: Passage rate of students completing requirements for initial teacher certification in state competency tests by subject-matter area[5]	A minimum measure of new teacher competency. Also an indicator of teacher education program quality.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - ISBE
2C3: Number of teachers and administrators served by the institution as a ISBE registered provider through professional development activities	A measure of the extent to which the institution is engaged in providing substantive professional development of Illinois P-12 educators.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Institutions
2C4: Institutional Strategies to Foster P-16 Partnerships ▪ Has formalized partnerships with P-12 schools and school districts. ▪ Provides teacher endorsement content training for P-12 teachers ▪ Collaborates with P-12 schools and school districts on recruitment and retention of new teachers. ▪ Collaborates with P-12 schools and school districts on professional development for teachers and administrators.	Reflects the extent of the institution's linkage with P-12 education in Illinois.	Dichotomous	Internal benchmarking	*No - Institutions*

[5] This indicator only applies to institutions with teacher education programs. Includes completers of initial certificate programs.

Goal 3: Affordability (Statewide)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
3S1: Average undergraduate tuition and fees vs. Illinois per capita disposable income (by sector)	Measures of the level of financial access to Illinois higher education.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes – ISAC, Annual Illinois Student Financial Aid Survey.
3S2: Distribution of financial aid received by undergraduates by type and source of aid (by sector)				Yes – Annual Illinois Student Financial Aid Survey.
3S3: Proportion of enrolled undergraduate students who receive financial aid by type of aid and overall (by sector)				Yes – Annual Illinois Student Financial Aid Survey.
3S4: Average Monetary Award Program (MAP) award as a percent of weighted average undergraduate tuition and fees (by sector)				Yes – ISAC, Annual Illinois Student Financial Aid Survey.
3S5: Net price of attendance for undergraduates who receive aid by income quintile, after MAP, Pell, and institutional grant awards are subtracted[6] (by sector)				*No – Institutions, ISAC, U.S. Census Bureau.*

[6]The "net price" reflects the total cost of attendance for a student at an institution as determined by the institution for use in making financial aid awards to undergraduates, including tuition and fees, housing (e.g., room and board), transportation, books, and supplies.

Goal 3: Affordability (Common Institutional Indicators)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
3C1: Distribution of financial aid received by undergraduates by type and source of aid.	Indicates the level of financial access to the institution for students.	Continuous/numeric	Both internal benchmarking and external comparisons	Yes - Annual Illinois Student Financial Aid Survey.
3C2: Proportion of enrolled undergraduate students who receive financial aid, by type of aid and overall.				Yes - Annual Illinois Student Financial Aid Survey.
3C3: Net price of attendance for undergraduates who apply for aid by income quintile, after MAP, Pell, and institutional grant awards are subtracted.[7]				*No – Institutions, ISAC, U.S. Census Bureau.*

[7]The "net price" reflects the total cost of attendance for a student at an institution as determined by the institution for use in making financial aid awards to undergraduates, including tuition and fees, housing (e.g., room and board), transportation, books, and supplies.

Goal 4: Access and Diversity (Statewide)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
4S1: Completions by race/ethnicity, disability status, and gender (by level and sector)[8]	Reflects the success of Illinois higher education in graduating students from underrepresented groups in particular.	Continuous/numeric	Both internal benchmarking/external comparisons	Yes - IPEDS, Annual Underrepresented Groups report.

[8] Includes both the number and relative proportion of completions by race/ethnicity, disability status, and gender.

Goal 4: Access and Diversity (Common Institutional Indicators)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
4C1: Completions (number and proportion) by race/ethnicity, disability status, and gender (by level)[9]	Reflects the success of the institution in graduating students from underrepresented groups in particular.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - IPEDS
4C2: Institutional Strategies to Increase the Number and Diversity of Students Completing Academic Programs ▪ Has academic support services (e.g., tutoring, supplemental instruction) ▪ Has student support services (e.g., counseling, career services) ▪ Has an institutional diversity policy ▪ Has an institutional diversity office/coordinator ▪ Has an institutional diversity committee ▪ Has an institutional office for international students/coordinator ▪ Has an institutional office for students with disabilities/coordinator	Reflects the institution's commitment to enhancing access and diversity.	Dichotomous	Internal benchmarking	*No - Institutions*

[9]Includes both the number and relative proportion of completions by race/ethnicity, disability status, and gender.

Goal 5: High Quality (Statewide)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
5S1: State-level Quality Assurance Processes in Place: ▪ State approval required to offer specific academic programs ▪ State requirement that institutions assess student learning at the academic program level ▪ State requirement to review academic programs for improvement on a regular basis	Reflects the extent to which these quality assurance mechanisms are in place at the state-level to ensure quality throughout Illinois' system of higher education.	Dichotomous	Internal benchmarking	*No - IBHE*

Goal 5: High Quality (Common Institutional Indicators)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
5C1: Extent to which institutional quality and effectiveness are recognized by graduates	Provides the perspective of graduates regarding their educational experience.	Continuous/numeric and dichotomous	Internal benchmarking	Yes – Periodic alumni satisfaction surveys
5C2: Pass rates on professional/occupational licensure exams relative to state and/or national averages	A measure of program quality assurance and effectiveness.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes – Institutions, IL Department of Professional Regulation, Testing agencies.
5C3: Proportion of all degree programs with a systematic assessment of student learning outcomes.	Reflects the institution's commitment to assessment of learning outcomes. Relates to *The Illinois Commitment* plan that "by 2004, all academic programs will systematically assess student learning and use assessment results to improve programs."	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	*No - Institutions*
5C4: Proportion of all degree programs meeting standards for program accreditation for which program accreditation is available	A measure of program quality assurance.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	*No – Institutions*

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
5C5: Institutional Strategies to Enhance Quality and Assessment ▪ Has an institution-wide policy of using assessment results to improve program quality. ▪ Has formalized end of program assessment for all academic programs.	Reflects the institution's commitment to academic quality assurance.	Dichotomous	Internal benchmarking	*No - Institutions*

Goal 6: Productivity and Accountability (Statewide)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
6S1: Cost of instruction per credit hour by student level: sector averages[10]	A measure of instructional efficiency over time for public universities and community colleges	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Annual Public University and Community College Cost Studies
6S2: Proportion of first-time, full-time freshmen who complete their degree within 150% of normal time, or are still enrolled or transferred: sector ranges.	A statewide measure of student success.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking and external comparisons	Yes - NCES Graduation Rate Survey
6S3: Administrative and support cost per credit hour (all levels): sector averages[10]	A measure of average administrative and support costs over time by sector.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Annual Public University and Community College Cost Studies

Goal 6: Productivity and Accountability (Common Institutional Indicators)

Indicator	Rationale for Inclusion	Basis of Measurement	Basis for Assessing Performance	Regularly Collected?/ Likely Data Source
6C1: Undergraduate time to degree (Bachelor's and Associate)	A measure of the length of time required to complete an undergraduate degree at the institution.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	*No - Institutions*
6C2: Cost of instruction per credit hour by student level and as a percent of sector average by student level[10]	A measure of instructional efficiency over time for the institution	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Annual Public University and Community College Cost Studies
6C3: Administrative and support cost per credit hour and as a percent of sector average[10]	A measure of administrative and support costs over time at the institution.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - Annual Public University and Community College Cost Studies
6C4: Proportion of first-time, full-time freshmen who complete their degree within 150% of normal time, or are still enrolled or transferred	A measure of student success.	Continuous/numeric	Internal benchmarking	Yes - NCES Graduation Rate Survey

[10] Includes public universities and community colleges only.

APPENDIX B

SUGGESTED OPERATIONAL PARAMETERS RELATED TO POTENTIAL INDICATORS

Overview

During the process of developing the preliminary recommendations on potential performance indicators, it became clear to Committee members that having a set of suggested operational parameters for the indicators would be extremely beneficial, not only in terms of Committee discussions, but also in clarifying Committee intent on these indicators for the public input process. The approach adopted by the Committee has been that goal-setting and reporting for any indicator should be at the highest, meaningful level of aggregation. Institutions are encouraged to track indicators at more refined levels of aggregation as needed for internal monitoring and use. Suggested operational parameters are presented for a majority of the potential indicators, including the following:

- Source of Data
- Suggested Measurement Approach
- Suggested Measurement Timeframe
- Topics and Issues to be Discussed

Suggested parameters are not included for the dichotomous indicators given their non-quantitative nature.

Goal 1: Economic Growth

Statewide Indicators

1S1: Satisfaction of Illinois Business and Industry With Illinois Higher Education

Source of Data: Periodic surveys at state level.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Report on degree of satisfaction of Illinois business and industry regarding the following:

- Satisfaction with new hires that are Illinois college and university graduates on their knowledge and abilities in substantive areas (e.g., accounting, engineering) as well as communication skills and work ethic.

- Satisfaction with services received from Illinois colleges and universities in the areas of technical assistance, training/education for current employees, and research partnerships.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Periodic.

Topics and Issues to Be Discussed: How often should survey be conducted (e.g., every three years? Every five years?). Should survey be limited only to Illinois-based businesses or include all businesses? What kinds of businesses should be included/not included in the survey sample?

1S2: Annual Sponsored Research Expenditures

Source of Data: National Science Foundation's (NSF) annual "Science and Engineering Indicators" report.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Aggregate research and development (R&D) expenditures by Illinois colleges and universities from the following sources of funds: Federal government, Non-federal government, and Industry. Dollars reported both in total and as a percent of U.S. total R&D expenditures from these fund sources.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend – most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes (number, percent, and change in proportion).

Topics and Issues to Be Discussed: Open.

1S3: Annual Technology Transfer Activities

Source of Data: Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM) annual survey.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Aggregate figures for Illinois colleges and universities participating in the AUTM survey on the following measures:

- Number of inventions disclosed per $1 million spending on research.
- Number of U.S. patent applications filed per $1 million spending on research
- License/option agreements relative to number of inventions disclosed.

Data will be reported relative to the overall averages for all U.S. colleges and universities participating in the AUTM survey.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend – most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes (number, percent, and change in proportion).

Topics and Issues to Be Discussed: Are these the most appropriate measures given the data available on technology transfer?

1S4: Annual Number of Graduates By Level and Broad Field of Study

Source of Data: IPEDS (Illinois reporting, Table Z)

Suggested Measurement Approach: Aggregate degrees awarded throughout the state, and report the statewide totals by broad field of study within each level.

Above completions to be reported as number and proportion of total according to:

- Level: Pre-baccalaureate, Baccalaureate, and Post-baccalaureate
- Fields of Study: Agriculture, Business, Education, Engineering, Health Sciences, All other

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes (number and percent)

Topics and Issues to Be Discussed: Are these the appropriate aggregations by field of study?

Common Institutional Indicators

1C1: Percent of Degree/Certificate Recipients Either Employed or Enrolled in Further Education Within One Year of Graduation

Source of Data: Periodic alumni surveys by institutions; Illinois Community College System Occupational Follow-up Study.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Summary of questions on employment status and education status one year after graduation. Numerator is the number of alumni respondents either employed in a related field (full- or part-time) OR enrolled in further education (full- or part-time). Denominator is total number of alumni respondents.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Will vary by institutions with the cycle of their alumni follow-up surveys.

Topics and Issues to Be Discussed: How often should institutions report these results? Should employment numbers only be limited to those graduates in a related field, or should it include all employment?

1C2: Numbers of Continuing Education, Training, and Service Programs Offered By Institutions for Business and Industry Audiences

Source of Data: Institutions.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Aggregate number of programs offered for business and industry audiences. The criteria for inclusion as a "program" within this indicator includes the following: (1) the primary audience for this program must be private sector organizations, although it can also include programs directed to public sector organizations if the purpose is related to economic development; (2) there must be active involvement in program development by an institutional representative on behalf of the institution beyond simple room or facility assignment; and (3) program participants must register or enroll. Within these criteria, the programs can include all credit and non-credit activities offered on- or off-campus, including customized training programs developed for business and industry clientele by the institution.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes (number and percent)

Topics and Issues to Be Discussed: Is the suggested measurement approach feasible and meaningful?

Goal 2: Partnerships with P-12 Education

Statewide Indicators

2S1: Annual Number of Students Completing Requirements for Initial Teacher Certification by Certificate Area

Source of Data: Institutions/ISBE (summed from common institutional indicator 2C1)

Suggested Measurement Approach: Aggregated headcount of potential new teachers from all Illinois colleges and universities with teacher education programs. The population includes all baccalaureate graduates in teacher education programs, plus others completing requirements for initial teacher certification with or without a degree being awarded. Certificate areas are aggregated as follows:

- Early Childhood Education
- Elementary
- Secondary
- Special Education

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes (number and percent)

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: To what extent could this result in "double counting" of students who can be certified in more than one area, and is this a problem? Are the certificate areas aggregated appropriately?

2S2: Annual Number of Students Completing Requirements for Initial Teacher Certification by Race/Ethnicity

Source of Data: Institutions/ISBE

Suggested Measurement Approach: Aggregated headcount of potential new teachers from all Illinois colleges and universities with teacher education programs. The population includes all baccalaureate graduates in teacher education programs, plus others completing requirements for initial teacher certification with or without a degree being awarded. Race/Ethnicity categories include the following:

- Black, Non-Hispanic
- Hispanic
- All others

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes (number and percent)

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: Open.

2S3: Passage Rate of Students Completing Requirements for Initial Teacher Certification in State Competency Tests by Subject-Matter Area

Source of Data: Institutions/ISBE (Compiled from common institutional indicator 2C2)

Suggested Measurement Approach: The population includes all baccalaureate graduates in teacher education programs, plus others completing requirements for initial teacher certification with or without a degree being awarded who took the tests that year. The subject areas are aggregated as follows:

- Mathematics
- Physical and Life Sciences

- English
- Social Sciences
- Teaching special populations
- Other subject areas

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: To what extent could this result in "double counting" of students who can be certified in more than one area, and is this a problem? Are the subject matter areas aggregated appropriately?

Common Institutional Indicators

2C1: Annual Number of Students Completing Requirements for Initial Teacher Certification by Certificate Area

Source of Data: Institution/ISBE

Suggested Measurement Approach: Only reported by institutions with teacher education programs. The population includes all baccalaureate graduates in teacher education programs, plus others completing requirements for initial teacher certification with or without a degree being awarded. Certificate areas are aggregated as follows:

- Early Childhood Education
- Elementary
- Secondary
- Special Education

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes (number and percent)

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: To what extent could this result in "double counting" of students who can be certified in more than one area, and is this a problem? Are the certificate areas aggregated appropriately?

2C2: Passage Rate of Students Completing Requirements for Initial Teacher Certification in State Competency Tests by Subject-Matter Area

Source of Data: Institutions/ISBE

Suggested Measurement Approach: Only reported by institutions with teacher education programs. The population includes all baccalaureate graduates in teacher education programs, plus others completing requirements for initial teacher certification with or without a degree being awarded who took the tests that year. The subject-matter areas are aggregated as follows:

- Mathematics
- Physical and Life Sciences
- English
- Social Sciences

- Teaching special populations
- Other subject areas

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: To what extent could this result in "double counting" of students who can be certified in more than one area, and is this a problem? Are the subject matter areas aggregated appropriately?

Goal 3: Affordability

Statewide Indicators

3S1: Average Undergraduate Tuition and Fees vs. Illinois Per Capita Disposable Income (by sector)

Source of Data: Illinois Student Assistance Commission Data Books and IBHE Staff Estimates

Suggested Measurement Approach: Annual percentage change of average undergraduate tuition and fees at public universities, community colleges, and private institutions vs. the percentage change in the Illinois per capita disposable income.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: Should private institutions be disaggregated into private not-for-profit and private for-profit?

3S2: Distribution of Financial Aid Received by Undergraduates By Type and Source of Aid (by sector)

Source of Data: Annual Illinois Student Financial Aid Survey

Suggested Measurement Approach: Dollar and percentage distribution of financial aid received by Illinois undergraduates at public universities, community colleges, and private institutions, by type (i.e., grants/scholarships, tuition waivers, loans, and employment) and source (i.e., federal, state, institutional, and other).

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: Should private institutions be disaggregated into private not-for-profit and private for-profit?

3S3: Proportion of Undergraduate Students who Receive Financial Aid by Type of Aid and Overall (by sector)

Source of Data: Annual Illinois Student Financial Aid Survey; Fall Enrollment Survey.

Suggested Measurement Approach: The unduplicated headcount of undergraduate financial aid recipients by aid type (i.e., gift assistance, loans, employment, and total) as a percent of unduplicated annual undergraduate headcount enrollment at public universities, community colleges, and private institutions.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: Should private institutions be disaggregated into private not-for-profit and private for-profit?

3S5: Net Price of Attendance for Undergraduates Who Receive Aid By Income Quintile, After MAP, Pell, and Institutional Grant Awards are Subtracted (by sector)

Source of Data: ISAC, Institutional sources, U.S. Census Bureau.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Calculation of the average net price to undergraduates which reflects the total cost of attendance for students at public universities, community colleges, and private institutions as determined by the institution for use in making financial aid awards to undergraduates, including tuition and fees, housing (e.g., room and board), transportation, books, and supplies. Income is defined as the gross income from all sources for Illinois families with no related subfamilies as reported by the U.S. Bureau of the Census in the annual March supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS). The family income distribution for all Illinois families is divided into quintile ranges, with mean incomes calculated for each quintile.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: Should private institutions be disaggregated into private not-for-profit and private for-profit?

Common Institutional Indicators

3C1: Distribution of Financial Aid Received by Undergraduates By Type and Source of Aid

Source of Data: Annual Illinois Student Financial Aid Survey

Suggested Measurement Approach: Dollar and percentage distribution of financial aid received by Illinois undergraduates at each institution, by type (i.e., grants/scholarships, tuition waivers, loans, and employment) and source (i.e., federal, state, institutional, and other).

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: Open.

3C2: Proportion of Undergraduate Students who Receive Financial Aid by Type of Aid and Overall

Source of Data: Annual Illinois Student Financial Aid Survey; Fall Enrollment Survey.

Suggested Measurement Approach: The unduplicated headcount of undergraduate financial aid recipients by aid type (i.e., gift assistance, loans, employment, and total) as a percent of unduplicated annual undergraduate headcount enrollment at each institution. Include both number and percent.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: Open.

3C3: Net Price of Attendance for Undergraduates Who Receive Aid By Income Quintile, After MAP, Pell, and Institutional Grant Awards are Subtracted

Source of Data: ISAC, Institutional sources.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Calculation of the average net price to undergraduates which reflects the total cost of attendance for students at public universities, community colleges, and private institutions as determined by the institution for use in making financial aid awards to undergraduates, including tuition and fees, housing (e.g., room and board), transportation, books, and supplies. Income is defined as the gross income from all sources for Illinois families with no related subfamilies as reported by the U.S. Bureau of the Census in the annual March supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS). The family income distribution for all Illinois families is divided into quintile ranges, with mean incomes calculated for each quintile.[11]

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: Open

Goal 4: Access and Diversity

Statewide Indicators

4S1: Completions by Race/Ethnicity, Disability Status, and Gender (by level and sector)

Source of Data: IPEDS (Illinois reporting, Table Z), Underrepresented Groups Report

Suggested Measurement Approach: Aggregate degrees awarded throughout the state according to:

- Race/ethnicity: Black, Non-Hispanic; Hispanic; All Others
- Disability status: Disabled; Not disabled
- Gender: Male; Female

Above completions to be reported as number and proportion of total according to:

- Level: Pre-baccalaureate, Baccalaureate, and Post-baccalaureate
- Sector: Public universities, Community colleges, Private institutions

[11] Note: Each institution will use the same set of income quintile ranges for Illinois families, which will also be the same ones used in indicator 3S4, to be provided by the IBHE staff.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend – most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Topics and Issues to Be Discussed: Availability of data on degrees received according to disability status of students. Should private institutions be disaggregated into private not-for-profit and private for-profit?

Common Institutional Indicators

4C1: Completions by Race/Ethnicity, Disability Status, and Gender (by level)

Source of Data: IPEDS (Illinois reporting, Table Z), Underrepresented Groups Report

Suggested Measurement Approach: Aggregate degrees awarded by the institution according to:

- Race/ethnicity: Black, Non-Hispanic; Hispanic; All Others
- Disability status: Disabled; Not disabled
- Gender: Male; Female

Above completions to be reported as number and proportion of total according to:

- Level: Pre-baccalaureate, Baccalaureate, and Post-baccalaureate

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend – most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Topics and Issues to Be Discussed: Availability of data on degrees received according to disability status of students.

Goal 5: High Quality

Common Institutional Indicators

5C1: Extent to Which Institutional Quality and Effectiveness are Recognized by Graduates

Sources of Data: Illinois Community College System Occupational Follow-up Study (one year) and Baccalaureate Follow-up Study (one, five, and nine years).

Suggested Measurement Approach: The information will be presented as the percentage of respondents who indicated that they were satisfied (Very Satisfied/Satisfied or Strongly Positive/Positive/Somewhat Positive) as indicated on responses to relevant questions on these surveys.

Potential Baccalaureate Follow-up Study Satisfaction Questions

Rating Scale 1. Strongly positive; 2. Positive; 3. Somewhat positive; 4. Somewhat negative; 5. Negative; 6. Strongly negative

What is your present attitude towards the University (Campus)?

What is your present attitude towards your bachelor's degree major?
Professors accessible?
Professors had high expectations?
Professors emphasize study/planning?
Professors provided timely feedback?
Students expected to work cooperatively?
Students encouraged to challenge ideas?
Professors used appropriate teaching activities?

Potential Occupational Follow-up Study Satisfaction Questions

Rating Scale 1. Very dissatisfied; 2. Somewhat dissatisfied; 3. Somewhat satisfied; 4. Very satisfied; Blank - No response to this item; 0 - Did not use (for services).

Satisfaction with Program Components and Other Courses
Content of Program Skills Courses (Survey Item 10a ,11a):
Lecture, Lab Experience (Survey Item 10b, 11b):
Equipment, Facilities, and Materials (Survey Item 10c, 11c):
Job Preparation (Survey Item 10d, 11d)
Preparation for Further Education (Survey Item 10e, 11e)
Information on Current Employment (Survey Item 10f)

Satisfaction with Services
Financial Aid (Survey Item 12a):
Academic Advising (Survey Item 12b):
Career Planning (Survey Item 12c):
College Transfer Planning (Survey Item 12d):
Counseling (Survey Item 12e):
Tutoring (Survey Item 12f):
Library/Audio Visual (Survey Item 12g):
Student Activities (Survey Item 12h):

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Most recent two surveys for each sector.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: For the public universities, should the all three follow-up surveys be used (i.e., 1, 5, and 9 years after graduation), or just the survey administered one-year after graduation?

5C2: Pass Rates on Professional/Occupational Licensure Exams Relative to State and/or National Averages

Source of Data: Illinois Department of Professional Regulations (IDPR), Institutional sources.

Suggested Measurement Approach: The initial emphasis will be on the pass rate of graduates in selected professional/occupational programs licensed/registered/regulated by the Illinois Department of Professional Regulations (IDPR). Additional data will be gathered from the Illinois Board of Admissions to the Bar for attorneys. Pass rate information will correspond with the methodology in place for the licensing entity. Generally, the rate will be calculated for each designated specialty program with the calculation based on the number of graduates who pass the test as a percentage of those who took the test. IDPR data are most available for individuals in healthcare fields. Pass rates will be presented relative to state and/or national exam averages.

Suggested Fields: Universities – Law, Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing (RN), and Accounting. Community Colleges – Emergency Medical Technician, Medical Radiologic Technician, Dental Hygienist, and Nursing (RN).

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Most recent two years of results for each sector.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: Timing and responsibility for the data match. Student name is a required data element by IDPR officials to proceed with the data match process. Full cooperation of licensing/regulating entities will be necessary to have data for the report. Institutions should be provided with an opportunity to furnish contextual and/or benchmark information to establish a perspective for evaluating the pass rate information. Are there other professional/occupational programs that should be considered?

5C3: Proportion of all Degree Programs With a Systematic Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Source of Data: Institutional analysis.

Suggested Measurement Approach: The measurement focus will be on credit generating academic programs. Institutions will determine the extent to which each degree or certificate program listed separately on the Illinois Community College Board Curriculum Master Inventory or the Illinois Board of Higher Education Program Inventory includes a systematic assessment of student learning outcomes. The numerator will be the number of those programs that have a systematic assessment of student learning outcomes. The denominator will be the total number of programs as indicated in the ICCB and IBHE inventories. The outcome will be presented as a single percentage.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Most recent two years.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: The impact of varying assessment practices across disciplines and programs.

5C4: Proportion of all Degree Programs Meeting Standards for Program Accreditation for Which Program Accreditation is Available

Source of Data: Institutional analysis.

Suggested Measurement Approach: The population will be all credit generating academic programs listed separately on the Illinois Community College Board Curriculum Master Inventory or the Illinois Board of Higher Education Program Inventory that can be accredited by a specialized accrediting body as recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation in its most recent annual *Directory of Participating and Recognized Organizations*. The numerator will be the number of those programs that met standards for accreditation by the relevant accrediting body in the given year. The denominator will be the number of programs eligible for accreditation by a relevant accrediting body in the given year. The outcome will be presented as a single percentage.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Most recent two years.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: Ability of institutions to identify those programs that meet accreditation standards but are not actually accredited.

Goal 6: Productivity and Accountability

Statewide Indicators

6S1: Cost of Instruction per Credit Hour by Student Level (sector averages)

Source of Data: Illinois Board of Higher Education Discipline Cost Study; Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study

Suggested Measurement Approach: The methodologies established and used in the Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study and the Illinois Board of Higher Education Comparative Cost Study will be followed in this analysis. For community colleges, this will be the net instructional unit cost that includes the direct and indirect costs for instruction. For universities, this will be the total instructional cost with university overheads excluding O&M physical plant costs. For trend analysis, the figures will be adjusted for inflation using the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI).

Levels: Community College Level – Undergraduate Lower Division.
University Student Levels - Undergraduate Lower Division, Undergraduate Upper Division, Graduate I and Graduate II.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: Technical differences exist between the methodologies used to calculate the instructional cost per credit hour in the two data sources (IBHE and ICCB). The figures generated from each source are similar enough for comparative usage; however, caution should be used in comparing community college and public university unit cost information.

6S2: Proportion of First-time, Full-time Freshmen who Complete their Degree Within 150 percent of Normal Time, or are Still Enrolled or Transferred (sector ranges)

Source of Data: IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey institutional responses.

Suggested Measurement Approach: An entering cohort of first-time, full-time freshmen is identified and tracked to determine those who complete degrees or certificate within 150% of published catalog (normal) time, or are still enrolled, or have transferred. The general methodology follows the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) methodology. The numerator is the number of individuals in the cohort who graduate, transfer, or are still enrolled at the end of the observation period (3 years for community colleges or 6 years for universities). The denominator is first-time, full-time freshmen in the designated fiscal year.

Data are presented as the minimum and maximum of the range for community colleges and public universities separately as well as the median value for each sector.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: First-time, full-time freshmen in Fall 1997 (FY 1998) for community colleges and Fall 1995 (FY 1996) for universities. The community college entering cohort is tracked for three years. The university entering cohort is tracked for six years.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: The cohort should match the corresponding first-time, full-time Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) count.

6S3: Administrative and Support Cost per Credit Hour (sector averages)

Source of Data: Illinois Board of Higher Education Cost Study; Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study

Suggested Measurement Approach: The methodologies established and used in the Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study and the Illinois Board of Higher Education Comparative Cost Study will be followed in this analysis. For community colleges, this includes the indirect instructional support areas unit costs. For universities, this includes academic support, student services, and institutional support unit costs. Figures used should exclude operational costs of the physical plant. Fixed costs should also be excluded. For trend analysis, the figures will be adjusted for inflation using the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI).

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: Technical differences exist between the methodologies used to calculate the administrative and support cost per credit hour in the two data sources (IBHE and ICCB). The figures generated from each source are similar enough for comparative usage; however, caution should be used in comparing community college and public university unit cost information.

Common Institutional Indicators

6C1: Undergraduate Time to Degree (Bachelor's and Associate)

Source of Data: Community College Annual Enrollment and Completion (A1) file; Illinois Community College and University Shared Data files and internal university records.

Suggested Measurement Approach: Median time to degree (number of years, i.e. 3.7) will be calculated based on a retrospective view of the actual time an exiting cohort of degree recipients took to complete the formal award for those students who first matriculated as new freshmen at the institution. Community colleges will track associate degree completers and universities will track bachelor's degree graduates.

The median number of years between exit and initial entry at the institution which awarded the degree will be calculated using the following methodology:

1. Start with the total number of students receiving a degree at the institution in a given year.
2. Exclude those individuals who first matriculated as new freshmen at another institution (i.e., transfer students)
3. Calculate the median number of years to degree completion for those remaining graduates who had first matriculated as new freshmen at the institution.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: FY 2002 graduates will be tracked backward to initial

enrollment within the scope of available data.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: Is there a maximum number of years backward that enrollments will be tracked?

6C2: Cost of Instruction per Credit Hour by Student Level

Source of Data: Illinois Board of Higher Education Discipline Cost Study; Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study

Suggested Measurement Approach: The methodologies established and used in the Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study and the Illinois Board of Higher Education Comparative Cost Study will be followed in this analysis. For community colleges, this will be the net instructional unit cost that includes the direct and indirect costs for instruction. For universities, this will be the total instructional cost with university overheads excluding O&M physical plant costs. For trend analysis, the figures will be adjusted for inflation using the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI).

Present data as a percentage of the state weighted average unit cost by level as well as a dollar amount. For trend analysis, the figures will be adjusted for inflation using the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI).

Levels Community College Levels – Undergraduate Lower Division.
University Student Levels are as follows Undergraduate Lower Division, Undergraduate Upper Division, Graduate I and Graduate II.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: Technical differences exist between the methodologies used to calculate the instructional costs per credit hour in the two data sources (IBHE and ICCB). The figures generated from each source are similar enough for comparative usage; however, caution should be used in comparing community college and public university unit cost information.

6C3: Proportion of First-time, Full-time Freshmen who Complete their Degree Within 150 percent of Normal Time, or are Still Enrolled or Transferred

Source of Data: Institutional IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey data.

Suggested Measurement Approach: An entering cohort of first-time, full-time freshmen is identified and tracked to determine those who complete degrees or certificate within 150% of published catalog (normal) time, or are still enrolled, or have transferred. The general methodology follows the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) methodology. The numerator is the number of individuals in the cohort who graduate, transfer, or are still enrolled at the end of the observation period (3 years for community colleges or 6 years for universities). The denominator is first-time, full-time freshmen in the designated fiscal year.

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: First-time, full-time freshmen in Fall 1997 (FY 1998) for community colleges and Fall 1995 (FY 1996) for universities. The community college entering cohort is tracked for three years. The university entering cohort is tracked for six years.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: The cohort should match the corresponding first-time, full-time Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) count.

6C4: Administrative and Support Cost per Credit Hour and as a Percent of the Sector Average

Source of Data: Illinois Board of Higher Education Cost Study; Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study

Suggested Measurement Approach: Calculate the average administrative and support cost per credit hour and also show as a percent of the sector average (see indicator 6S3). The methodologies established and used in the Illinois Community College Board Unit Cost Study and the Illinois Board of Higher Education Discipline Cost Study will be followed in this analysis. For community colleges, this includes the indirect instructional support areas unit costs. For universities, this includes academic support, student services, and institutional support unit costs. Figures used should exclude operational costs of the physical plant. Fixed costs should also be excluded. For trend analysis, the cost per credit hour figures will be adjusted for inflation using the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI).

Suggested Measurement Timeframe: Multi-year trend - most recent one-, two-, and five-year changes.

Topics and Issues to be Discussed: Technical differences exist between the methodologies used to calculate the administrative and support cost per credit hour in the two data sources (IBHE and ICCB). The figures generated from each source are similar enough for comparative usage; however, caution should be used in comparing community college and public university unit cost information.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").